

## REMARKS

Initially, Applicant would like to express appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed Official Action provided, for the acknowledgment of Applicant's Information Disclosure Statements (IDS) by return of the Form PTO-1449, and for the acknowledgment of Applicant's Claim for Priority. Applicant is concurrently submitting herewith the certified copy of the priority document. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's allowance of claims 1-13 and 17, and for the indication of the allowability of claims 14-16. Upon entry of the present amendment, the Abstract will have been replaced, claim 14 will have been amended and claim 9 will have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-8 and 10-17 remain pending in the present application.

The Examiner has objected to the Abstract, finding that it is longer than 150 words. Applicant has counted the words in the Abstract and notes that the Abstract contains only 146 words. Nevertheless, without agreeing to the propriety of the Examiner's objection, Applicant submits herewith a replacement Abstract that is even shorter than the previously-submitted Abstract, and requests that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

The Examiner has also objected to claims 14-16, finding that "said photographing optical system," "said retracted state" and "said ready-to-photograph state" lack antecedent basis. Without agreeing to the propriety of the Examiner's objection and solely to expedite the patent application process, Applicant has amended claim 14 (from which claims 15-16 depend) to recite "A rotation transfer mechanism for a photographing optical system . . . " in the preamble, and to recite "a retracted state" and "a ready-to-photograph state," thereby rendering explicit what was already implied in this claim. It is thus respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings, requiring that the claimed zoom flash and its movable optical element being driven by the optical element driving mechanism must be shown of the features canceled from the claims. Without agreeing to the propriety of the Examiner's objection and solely to expedite the patent application process, Applicant has canceled claim 9 (without prejudice or disclaimer) which generally recited this feature. It is thus respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that each and every pending claim of the present application meets all requirements for patentability, and respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate the allowance of each and every pending claim in the present application.

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR THE INDICATION OF ALLOWABLE  
SUBJECT MATTER

In response to the Statement of Reasons for the Indication of Allowable Subject Matter, mailed by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on October 3, 2005, along with the above-noted Official Action, Applicant wishes to clarify the record with respect to the basis for patentability of the allowed claims in the present application. In this regard, while Applicant does not disagree with the Examiner's indications that certain identified features are not disclosed by the prior art references, as noted by the Examiner, Applicant further wishes to clarify that each of the independent claims in the present application recites a particular combination of features, and the basis for patentability of each of these claims is further based on the particular totality of the features recited therein. The dependent claims set forth additional basis for their patentability in accordance with their recited limitations as well as in accordance with the particular limitations of the respective base claims.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, reconsideration of the Examiner's action and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested and are believed to be appropriate.

Applicant notes that this amendment is being made to advance prosecution of the application to allowance, and has not been made to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, and should thus be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding this Response, or the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Takahiro IKEMIZO

William S. Boshnick  
Reg. No. 44,550



---

Bruce H. Bernstein  
Reg. No. 29,027

March 31, 2006  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, VA 20191  
(703) 716-1191